

FEB 8 1923

802

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or a School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at  
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.  
Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of  
March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on  
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVI, No. 15

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1923

WHOLE No. 438

## SPECIAL OFFER

Back Volumes of

## The Classical Weekly

at reduced rates

An exceptional opportunity to individuals and to libraries to complete their sets of The Classical Weekly

Complete Set, Volumes 1-15, \$20 (normal price, \$30)

Separate volumes, \$1.60 (if five or more are  
ordered, \$1.50 each)

The above offers are open to those who have paid for  
the current volume, XVI (October 1, 1922,  
to May 31, 1923)

Money must accompany order

Address Charles Knapp

1737 Sedgwick Avenue,

New York City

ONE feature sometimes "sells" a book, even a first-year Latin book, but if, in the storm and stress of the first Latin class, other virtues do not come to the support of this lone talking point, the book will not "stay sold". It cannot; for too much is at stake, too much is expected of the first Latin book.

It must arouse and sustain interest

It must link up English and Latin

It must prepare for Caesar

It must drill and review without becoming tiresome

Because it accomplishes all these things in good measure and to spare, because it compels respect for the subject and desire for its mastery, "Elements of Latin" is conspicuous because it *sells and stays sold*.

### **D'OOGÉ'S ELEMENTS OF LATIN**

PUBLISHED BY

Ginn and Company: Publishers

70 Fifth Ave.

New York

## **OVID IS NOW PRESCRIBED** by the College Entrance Examination Board for 1923, 1924, and 1925

**Gleason's A Term of Ovid—Revised** is unequalled for this Secondary School work. Some of the selections are in easy verse; others are legends of the gods and heroes of mythology. In the main, the vocabulary is the same as that of the first book of the Aeneid. The first hundred lines are divided into feet for scansion, with the accents and caesuras marked. Each selection is accompanied by an introduction, notes and summary.

### **GLEASON'S A TERM OF OVID—REVISED**

With Sight Readings

By CLARENCE W. GLEASON, A.M.

*Master of Greek and Latin, Roxbury Latin School, Boston. Price, \$1.12*

### **AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY**

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVI, No. 15

FEBRUARY 5, 1923

WHOLE No. 438

## MR. FRANKLIN ON THE DERIVATION OF CERTAIN WORDS

Elsewhere in this issue (114) is printed a paper entitled *A Study of the Derivation of 5,000 Words from Thorndike's Teacher's Word Book*.

In view of the special attention that for some time past has been directed to the general subject of the classical element in our English vocabulary, and in view more especially of the insistence laid in certain quarters upon the doctrine that we ought to teach Latin primarily with a view to strengthening the English vocabulary of our students, and their general mastery of their (supposed) mother tongue, I am glad to give space to this paper by Mr. Franklin.

Mr. Franklin is a graduate student of The Johns Hopkins University, and a High School teacher of Latin. His paper is the result of a study undertaken at the suggestion of Dr. Edward F. Buchner, Head of the Department of Education at The Johns Hopkins University.

The publication of Mr. Franklin's paper in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* must not be interpreted as in any sense an endorsement of the views expressed therein. To be quite frank, I do not know what value those views really have. Before attaching much value to them, I should want to know several things.

First, I should like to know whether any great importance is to be attached to the list of words given by Professor Thorndike in his monograph, *The Teacher's Word Book*.

I quote now from Professor Thorndike's Preface (iii), to show how his list was obtained:

The *Teacher's Word Book* is an alphabetical list of the 10,000 words which are found to occur most widely in a count of about 625,000 words from literature for children; about 3,000,000 words from the Bible and English classics; about 300,000 words from elementary-school text books; about 50,000 words from books about cooking, sewing, farming, the trades, and the like; about 90,000 words from the daily newspapers; and about 500,000 words from correspondence. Forty-one different sources were used.

Secondly, as I read Mr. Franklin's paper, I questioned his statement that a "conservative estimate would place the vocabulary of pupils entering the Junior High School at 5,000 words or more". I thought I had read that Shakespeare's vocabulary did not exceed 8,000 words. Too high an estimate of the vocabulary of pupils entering the Junior High School, with correspondingly excessive deduction from Professor Thorndike's list, might well make a very great difference in the results of such an investigation as Mr. Franklin's.

An expression of the foregoing doubt was made by letter to Mr. Franklin. He declared, in reply, that all

the available reports of the testing of vocabularies of pupils of the age referred to supported his claim. He stated that it was his understanding that Shakespeare's written vocabulary was in excess of 15,000 words. But this, he says, is aside from his point. His statement had reference to the passive, not to the active, vocabulary of Junior High School pupils. He does not claim that they are qualified to use 5,000 words in writing, but that they are able to recognize understandingly this number when they meet them in their reading. He doubts if their active vocabulary would exceed 600 or 700 words.

In the letter which I sent to Mr. Franklin, I argued also that, if the pupils had to learn somehow or other the 5,000 commonest words, it would seem to me worth while to make a study of the genesis of those 5,000 words. Mr. Franklin's reply was that I had misunderstood the purpose of his study. He would justify Latin, he says, on the ground that it will prove the source of 50 per cent of the new words which the pupil must master in High School (I take this to mean, the new words over and above the initial 5,000). A study of the first 5,000, he adds, is now being made in another University. He says that he does not see that it would be of any value in connection with his own study, the purpose of which he feels he has stated clearly enough in the paper itself. Plainly, he treated his own study as a completely isolated thing. I doubt if the best results—or if good results—are to be got in that way.

I notice that Webster's Collegiate Dictionary was used as the "final authority in locating the sources of the words". Why was not the Century Dictionary used? This whole matter of etymologies and of the sources of words is one beset with pitfalls, even for the most competent authority in the field of comparative philology or linguistics; the rest of us ought to walk very humbly in such fields, and we should use only the best available authority. Further, in my judgment, in addition to the best available printed authority, the best living authorities should be used, to check or to supplement, as the need shall be, what is in print. Such living authorities are few, always, in any one country, in the field of etymology, and their services are hard to enlist in such work as Mr. Franklin's; they are busy with forms of real research. Yet, work unchecked by them has little, if any, value.

In the last paragraph of his paper Mr. Franklin states that "the Latin percentage in the least frequent group exceeds that in the most frequent by only 4.6%". This is a misstatement of a sort I have seen elsewhere in articles of this type, a misstatement due to a curious misunderstanding of a simple mathematical

situation. 51.9% is, numerically, by mere count, only 4.6% greater than 47.3%. Yet, in actual fact, for practical purposes, 51.9% of anything is nearly 10% greater than 47.3% of the same thing. Plainly, a man who has \$51.90 has nearly 10% more money than a man who has only \$47.30. It has been said repeatedly that statistics can be made to prove anything. The possibilities along this line become all the greater—and more serious—if statistics are interpreted in defiance of simple elementary mathematical considerations and principles.

Plainly, in such a study as Mr. Franklin undertook, there were—and are—more things involved than were dreamt of by him in his philosophy—or, it would seem, of the Professor of Education for whom he prepared the paper.

C. K.

#### A STUDY OF THE DERIVATION OF 5,000 WORDS FROM THORNDIKE'S TEACHER'S WORD BOOK

The study here reported was made to determine, in terms of experimental evidence, the part which Latin may play in providing the vocabulary which should be attained by a pupil during the High School period. A number of writers have estimated that 60% of the words in the English language are of Latin origin. The present study was based upon The Teacher's Word Book, by Dr. E. L. Thorndike (published by Teachers College, 1921). A conservative estimate would place the vocabulary of pupils entering a Junior High School at 5,000 words or more. Accordingly, the 5,000 commonest words in Professor Thorndike's list were omitted in this experiment.

The groups of words whose credit-numbers<sup>1</sup> (according to Professor Thorndike's classification) range from nine to three were studied. Wherever possible, Webster's Collegiate Dictionary was used as the final authority in locating the sources of the words. The derivatives were classified as coming from Latin, Anglo-Saxon (including Middle English), French, and German. A separate count was made for each of the seven groups. The following principle of selection was employed in the case of words common to several languages: credit was given to the language in which the root originated, provided the form there found was of such a nature as to be helpful in disclosing the meaning of its English derivative; otherwise the first language which contained a form that would be of actual value in identifying the derivative was given the credit<sup>2</sup>. Whenever it was a moot point whether a word should be credited to Latin or to some other language, the latter was given the benefit of the doubt. Therefore, the Latin percentages presented below may be considered

<sup>1</sup>The "credit-number" following each word in the list gives a measure of the range and frequency of the word's occurrence. The higher credit-numbers are given to the words which occur most frequently in the list of 10,000. Credit-numbers 9-3 cover the following groups of words: 5,145-5,544; 5,545-6,047; 6,048-6,618; 6,619-7,262; 7,263-8,145; 8,146-9,190; 9,191-10,000.

<sup>2</sup>This is, to my mind, a fundamentally erroneous method of work. Besides, it introduces a dangerous subjective element.

C. K.  
C. K.

conservative. A record of the Latin source-words in each group was kept.

Table I shows the number of words studied in each group. Twenty-seven of the total in Professor Thorndike's seven groups were omitted.

Table I

Group	Credit-Number	Number of Words
I	9	387
II	8	493
III	7	565
IV	6	646
V	5	880
VI	4	1,040
VII	3	818

Total 4,829

The percentages of derivatives from each source-language in the separate groups and in the total collection are presented in Table II (the figures give percentages).

Table II

Group	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
Latin	47.3	50.1	47.7	48.8	46.9	47.7	51.9	48.6	
Anglo-Saxon	34.4	24.6	28.5	27.9	27.7	25.9	25.9	27.3	
French	6.4	9.5	8.7	8.3	10.5	9.5	8.1	8.9	
German	0.5	1.4	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.4	0.8	
All Others	11.6	14.4	14.1	14.1	14.1	16.0	13.7	14.4	

The most striking characteristic of the figures in Table II is, undoubtedly, their remarkable uniformity. The chief component of the miscellaneous class is Greek. A rather surprising outcome of the study is the revelation of the very low percentage (less than one per cent.) of words secured from the German. While no separate count was kept, it is the writer's impression that the Scandinavian tongues were somewhat more prolific in derivatives than the German.

The variation from group to group is too slight to reveal any distinct tendency. Does the importance of the Latin language as a source tend to increase as the frequency decreases? Certainly, these results do not furnish sufficient evidence to support such a claim, inasmuch as the Latin percentage in the least frequent group exceeds that in the most frequent by only 4.6%<sup>3</sup>. An investigation of the 5,000 or 10,000 words ranking, in frequency, immediately below the Thorndike 10,000 should provide an answer to that question.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, E. EARLE FRANKLIN  
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.

#### THE WIGMORE FAIR

A neighbor of mine who has a taste for old books, first editions, etc., recently brought back from England a manuscript charter in Latin of the time of James I, which she invited me to decipher and translate.

The charter is written on a sheet of parchment 18.5 by 29 inches. Each line runs across the sheet in its longer dimension, a fact which increases somewhat the difficulty of reading. A considerable space is occupied

<sup>3</sup>On this curious misstatement—most unfavorable to Latin—see my remarks on page 113.

C. K.



by an elaborate system of arabesque ornamentation, enclosing a vignette portrait of King James. The ink is dark brown, but there are traces of gilt in the decorative flourishes. The parchment is in a good state of preservation except for a ragged hole near one edge, which, however, does not interfere with the writing.

The document is a patent of King James I, dated at Westminster, February 6, 1610. It confers upon Sir Robert Harley the right to establish and maintain a weekly market and an annual fair in the town of Wigmore, in Herefordshire, on the western borders of England. It recites in barbarous Latin that, after thorough investigation, the King is convinced that Wigmore is a desirable place for such market and fair by reason of its situation and commercial importance and its adequate supply of inns and taverns, and that no harm will result in this new departure either to the royal interests or to other communities and more or less distant fairs. Accordingly, to Sir Robert Harley is granted the right to institute and maintain such market and fair, and to enjoy the customary privileges of the overlord, which seem to have included every conceivable kind of toll, commission, fee, and rake-off, together with the right of administering speedy justice in disputes arising during the fair. The document closes with a special provision charging the Keeper of the Great Seal to exact no fee from Sir Robert.

Such markets and fairs, it may be remarked, were very common in England and were of great importance in the commercial and industrial development of the country. They brought considerable profit to those who had them in charge. For one thing, during the market or fair all trade in the town and the surrounding country was suspended except within the precincts of the fair; thus all business was forced to pay its percentage to the lord of the fair.

The manuscript, on the whole, is fairly legible. It is the work of a careful scribe; the letters are well-formed and fairly uniform. The lines drawn with a stylus to guide the writing are still visible in places. Our scribe was so anxious to keep his right-hand margin even that, when a word ended before the close of the line, he carefully filled in the remaining space with a few *m*'s or *n*'s. Conversely, if near the end of the line his next word was a trifle too long for the space, he sometimes omitted from it enough letters to bring the word into the available space. Thus, at the end of one line, *pmsom* = *praemissorum*. Other abbreviations appear, however, where the ending of the line does not make them necessary. *Concess* = *concessionibus*, *lras* = *litteras*, *nras* = *nostras*, etc. A macron over a letter indicates the omission of the *m*; the termination *rem* or *rum* is represented by a special sign; *cur* stands for *curia*; and case-endings are often omitted.

*Suus* is written without compunction for *eius*, *existit* means nothing more than *est*, *quod* with a finite mode is always used for the classical infinitive with accusative subject, *hec* is written for *haec*, *Anglie* for *Angliae*, etc. *Coram* means 'under the authority of'; *infra villam* means 'in the town'; the preposition *in* is used with the ablative of time (e. g. *in die Martis*

means 'on Tuesday'). *Ipsa* seems sometimes to mean no more than *is*, and *unus* is nothing but the indefinite article. In one place I read *totum diem illam*, as if the writer was not sure whether *dies* was masculine or feminine and took no chances. *Absque*, 'without', and *super*, 'during', occur in legal and post-Augustan Latin and need not surprise us here. But the use of a clause as the substantive in an ablative absolute construction is worthy of comment. The writer wants to say, 'The fact that no definite mention is made herein of the exact amount of revenue does not invalidate this grant', or 'The fact that no definite mention is made to the contrary notwithstanding'. And he expresses it thus: *Eo quod expressa mentio minime existit non obstante*. A parallel to this is found in such passages as Horace, *Epp.* 1.10.50 *excepto quod non simul esses, cetera laetus*. But of course this formula and the phrases and meanings quoted above belong to the language of medieval law.

The vocabulary includes a great many legal terms which at best carry with them very little suggestion of Latin, and when shorn of case-endings according to the easy-going fashion of the law scribe they hardly seem words. A single line contains such forms as *tolnet*, *theolon*, *piccag*, *stallag*. These are English and French words made to serve in a Latin sentence by equipping them hastily with case-endings, in this instance invisible case-endings. *Tolnet* and *theolon* are the fees charged for a license to sell. *Stallage* is the rent for a stall in the fair. *Piccage* is the amount charged for digging post-holes in the fair-enclosure. The phrase *curia pedis pulverisati*, 'the court of dusty-foot', corrupted in English to *pie powder*, i. e. the French *pie poudreux*, is the name given to the court of summary jurisdiction in civil cases. The name 'dusty-foot' arose possibly because the informality of the proceedings excused disorder of dress, possibly because dusty-foot was for obvious reasons an appropriate designation of wandering traders and peddlers.

LOS ANGELES HIGH SCHOOL. WALTER ALISON EDWARDS  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

## WOMEN IN THE DAYS OF THE EMPIRE

Were we to envisage the women of the days of the Emperors, using, as our only sources, Dio Cassius, whose turn for a good story led to much garbling of the truth, or the slanderous Suetonius, or even Tacitus, the Caesar-hater, our picture would be inexact. Ferrero, in *The Women of the Caesars*, has tried to palliate the crimes of the infamous Messalina, Agrippina, and others. I desire merely to recall a few women of those black days, whose stories often lie unnoted in the works of the philosopher Seneca, Pliny the Younger, and Tacitus.

We read of the beautiful devotion of Seneca's wife, Paullina, when Nero's order came that his old tutor must die. The account of Tacitus (*Ann.* 15.63-64) beggars translation. Paullina needed no pluming of her will to induce her to share her husband's fate. She called upon the *percussor* to address himself to his

duty. Seneca tried to dissuade her, but his love for her was too great to expose her to calumny after his death.

... Vitae, inquit, delenimenta monstraveram tibi, tu mortis decus mavis: non invidere exemplo. Sit huius tam fortis exitus constantia penes utrosque par, claritudinis plus in tuo fine.

An incision was made in the arms of both. Nero, who entertained no dislike for Paulina, demurred, and had her wounds bound up. She lived for a few years

... laudabili in maritum memoria et ore ac membris in eum pallorem albens ut ostentui esset multum vitalis spiritus egestum.

Seneca himself records the affection of his wife (Epp. 104.1-6).

Tacitus remarks (Ann. 15.71) the love of Artoria Flaccilla and Egnatia Maximilla for their husbands, a love which led them to accompany their husbands into exile:

... Novio Prisco per amicitiam Senecae et Glitio Gallo atque Annio Pollioni infamatis magis quam convictis data exilia. Priscum Artoria Flaccilla coniunx comitata est, Gallum Egnatia Maximilla, magnis primum et integris opibus, post ademptis. . . .

Claudius, in the first year of his reign (41 A.D.), relegated the courtier-philosopher, Seneca, to Corsica, and banished Livilla on a charge of *liaison* with Seneca (Dio 60.4). No sooner had Seneca arrived at Corsica than his thoughts began to turn homeward. His first letter was a *consolatio*, addressed to his mother, apparently intended to be circulated at Rome, with a view to securing his recall. The letter is valuable as an autobiographical document, and no less so because of the information Seneca has given us about his mother, Helvia, to whom he seems to have been tenderly devoted. She had been brought up by a step-mother, who, unlike the step-mother of tradition, seems to have been a woman of sterling character, and genuinely fond of her step-children. Writing to Helvia, Seneca says (Ad Helviam 2.4):

Crevisti sub noverca, quam tu quidem omni obsequio et pietate, quanta vel in filia conspici potest, matrem fieri coegisti; nulli tamen non magno constitit etiam bona noverca.

Helvia was unlike other mothers whom Seneca knew (*ibidem*, 14.3):

... Tu patrimonium nostrum sic administrasti ut tamquam in tuis laborares, tamquam alienis abstineres; tu gratiae nostrae, tamquam alienis rebus uteris, peperisti et ex honoribus nostris nihil ad te nisi voluptas et inpena pertinuit. . . .

Seneca tells us that his mother was keenly interested in his studies, and that she found delight in the company of her son. In recounting her virtues, Seneca, in words that have a strangely modern flavor, says (*ibidem*, 16.4):

... non faciem coloribus ac lenociniis polluisti; numquam tibi placuit vestis quae nihil amplius nudaret cum poneretur: unicum tibi ornamentum, pulcherrima et nulli obnoxia aetati forma, maximum decus visa est pudicitia. . . .

The elder Seneca was a man of inflexible severity,

especially in his attitude toward the higher education of women. Of him Seneca writes to his mother (*ibidem*, 17.3-4):

... quantum tibi patris mei antiquus rigor permisit, omnes bonas artes non quidem comprehendisti, attigisti tamen. Utinam quidem virorum optimus, pater meus, minus maiorum consuetudini deditus voluisset te praeceptis sapientiae erudiri potius quam imbui! . . . Beneficio tamen rapacis ingenii plus quam pro tempore hausisti; iacta sunt disciplinarum omnium fundamenta: nunc ad illas revertere; tutam te praestabunt.

If we turn to a later generation, we find a picture of inexpressible charm in the devotion of Calpurnia and her husband, Pliny. What can be more delightful than the letter of Pliny (7.5), addressed to his wife, beginning *Incredibile est quanto desiderio tui tener. In causa amor primum, deinde quod non consuevimus abesse?* He lies broad awake during most of the night, picturing to himself her image; and in the daytime he unwittingly looks for her in her room, and, not finding her there, is filled with grief.

The eighth letter of Book 3 is of a piece with this. Calpurnia is a woman of discernment, with a *penchant* for books. Her solicitude for her husband when he takes up a case is poignant. She dispatches runners to see how Pliny is received, and, when he gives a *recitatio*, she is within ear-shot, concealed behind the arras. In 6.4 Pliny urges Calpurnia to write to him every day, or even twice a day, so that he may be more easy in spirit. In 6.7 we learn that Calpurnia, during her absence in Campania, reads Pliny's works, since she cannot have Pliny himself, and he, in turn, reads her letters over and over again, letters which, he assures us, possess a charm all their own.

In 3.16 Pliny writes to Nepos about a conversation he had with Fannia concerning Fannia's grandmother, Arria. Arria's husband, Caecina Paetus, and her son were both seized by an illness which was fatal to the son. The mother managed the funeral of the son with such secrecy that the father was ignorant of the death. Arria pretended that her son was better. This was the Paetus who had taken part in the revolt of Scribonianus in Dalmatia in 42. The governor was killed, but Paetus was arrested and brought to Rome, found guilty, and ordered to take his life. When his last hour had come, his wife seized a dagger and plunged it into her heart, with the words, *Paete, non dolet!* After the arrest of Paetus, when his captors were going to put him on board ship, his wife tried to accompany him, but, having been refused, she hired a fishing smack and followed him. Pliny also tells us (3.16) that, when her son-in-law, Thrasea, tried to dissuade her from taking her life, she said: *Nihil agitis, . . . potestis enim efficere ut male moriar, ut non moriar non potestis.* As she uttered these words, she sprang from her chair and dashed her head against the wall.

In 7.19, a letter addressed to Priscus, Pliny expresses his distress at the ill-health of Fannia, an illness which she had contracted while nursing one of the Vestals. We learn the interesting fact that, when a Vestal was very ill, she was removed from the Atrium Vestae,

and was entrusted to the care of a matron, until she recovered. Of this Fannia, Pliny writes: *Quae castitas illi, quae sanctitas, quanta gravitas, quanta constantia!* Like many women of the first century A.D., she followed her husband into exile, and was banished once on her own account; for her husband, Senecio, when accused of writing a life of Helvidius, remarked in self-defense that he had written the work at the suggestion of his wife. Fannia made no effort to clear herself of the charge, and even had the temerity to preserve the book, and take it with her into exile.

Pliny has a good word (7.24) for the picturesque old lady Ummidia Quadratilla:

... Vixit in contubernio aviae delicatae severissime et tamen obsequentissime. Habebat illa pantomimos fovebatque effusius quam principi feminae conveniret.

She had the good sense to send her grandson to his studies while she <solebat> se ut feminam in illo otio sexus animum laxare lusu calculorum, <solebat> spectare pantomimos suos. . . .

The unspeakable Agrippina may have had one friend of genuine fidelity in the person of her maid, Acerronia. Modern writers are wont to belittle Acerronia's self-sacrifice, I suppose, on the grounds of its seeming to be an act of unreason that anyone would give her life for a woman of Agrippina's stamp. Santvoord (*The House Of The Caesars*, 146) thinks that her heroic action was little more than a dog-like devotion. Holland (*Seneca*, 90) says:

... Acerronia either attempted to save herself at her mistress's expense, or else her mistress at her own—it must ever be doubtful which.

Nero had feigned a desire for a reconciliation with his mother, and had invited her to Baiae, ostensibly for this purpose, but really with murder in his heart. After unctuous attentions and honey words from her son, she went on board ship for the return voyage. Tacitus says (*Ann.* 14.5) that it was a starry-bright night:

... Noctem sideribus illustrem et placido mari quietam, quasi convincendum ad scelus, dii praebuere.

Agrippina had two companions:

... Crepereius Gallus haud procul gubernaculis adstabat, Acerronia super pedes cubitantis reclinis paenitentiam filii et recuperatam matris gratiam per gaudium memorabat. . . .

Through the clever offices of a freedman, Anicetus, Nero had had the vessel so constructed that, at a given signal, the ceiling, weighted down with lead, would collapse, and the boat sink. The ceiling fell in as arranged, crushing to death Crepereius, but by some good turn of fate Agrippina and Acerronia escaped. The boat failed to sink; so the oarsmen, who were privy to the scheme, capsized it by leaning on one side.

... Acerronia, imprudentia dum se Agrippinam esse utque subveniretur matri principis clamitt, contis et remis et quae fors optulerat navalibus telis conficitur.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE,  
NEW YORK CITY

ELI EDWARD BURRISS

## REVIEWS

*The Lupercalia.* By Alberta Mildred Franklin. Columbia University Dissertation. New York (privately printed, 1921). Pp. 105.

Some twelve years ago Deubner emphasized the necessity of discussing the Lupercalia from the standpoint of its history and evolution, and himself set the example in an article which appeared in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 13 (1910), 481-508. Miss Franklin attempts, in this dissertation, to give a fuller discussion, following somewhat the same general method.

In mechanical make-up this is a model dissertation. No footnotes mar the neat page (the notes are assembled after each chapter); an excellent Bibliography (98-102) precedes the adequate Index Rerum (103-105). The place of a Table of Contents is taken by a synopsis of the ten chapters. It fills a little over a page, but in this small compass it sets forth the author's thesis and the steps by which she proceeds to demonstrate it.

Chapter I, Introduction (3-17), sets forth the background of the discussion, the contrast between the Mediterranean and the Aryan religions, the former with its stress on deities of the earth, the latter with its worship of sky-gods. The discussion is clear and illuminating; nowhere have I seen the outlines of the subject better sketched. The bibliography for this chapter is especially full (13-17).

Miss Franklin goes on to show that the Lupercalia, which is a cult complex, is not the product of any one period, but an epitome of the religious experience of the Romans (Chapter II, 18-20). The wolf-deity in Greece is Pelasgian. Absorbed by Zeus and Apollo and associated with Pan, he drops his wild and ravenous nature and becomes kindly and gracious (Chapter III, 21-28). The wolf-deity in Italy was preeminently the animal of magic and popular superstition. The wolf is associated especially with Soranus, a chthonic god of the Faliscans. Mars absorbed a wolf-god. Originally the god was the wolf; then he became the averter of wolves, Lupercus. The running of the Luperci around the Palatine Hill Miss Franklin connects with the ritual flight of priests who had slain an animal that was consecrated to the god and then returned to partake of the flesh sacramentally (Chapter IV, 29-48).

In Greece the sacred goat replaces the wilder wolf, particularly for sacrifices of an expiatory type, as the worshiper advances in civilization (Chapter V, 49-52). In Italy, it appears chiefly in the worship of Faunus, of Juno, and in the Lupercalia. Rejecting Faunus as the deity of the Lupercalia, Miss Franklin discusses Juno, a deity of the old Ligurian stratum, especially Juno Caprotina, in whose cult there was a ritual of blows, with a preliminary flight-ritual (*Poplifugia*). After the union with the Sabines and under the influence of Juno Lucina, the blows with the goatskin were added to the Lupercalia and the running of the Luperci became no longer a flight-ceremony, but a means of inducing fertility (Chapter VI, 53-66).

The sacrifice of the dog in Greece and Italy is an



unusual rite. It originated in Thrace, and is an earmark of a chthonic god. In Italy it acquired an apotropaic power, and it was introduced into the Lupercalia, Miss Franklin thinks, by the Sabines, who had a peculiar tendency to chthonic worship and rites of purification (Chapters VII, VIII, 67-73, 74-82).

In the curious rite of smearing blood on the forehead and wiping it off with milk, we are to see Orphic elements that were grafted into the old Pelasgian cult during the first few years of the Hannibalic War (Chapter IX, 83-95). All through this development the old was partly replaced by the new, but even more largely reinterpreted. Thus it held its place till 494, when Pope Gelasius abrogated it. Even then it was replaced by a feast of the purification of the Virgin held on the same day (Chapter X, 96-97).

A rite of aversion, a fertility-charm, a ceremony of purification, an assurance of sacramental union—such is, to Miss Franklin, the evolution of the Lupercalia. She maintains that in its development the Lupercalia reflected the development of the Roman people, and was an epitome of the religious experience of the Romans (19). I confess I am not quite clear what she means by this. Is she thinking of the successive influences exerted on the Roman religion from without, or of its inner growth in the direction of increased spirituality? Probably the latter, for she says (2) that the Lupercalia was spiritualized by new rites of cleansing and by the assurance of kinship with the deity. There is no spiritual advance from a rite of aversion to a fertility-charm, nor from this to a ceremony of purification which deals no longer entirely with material uncleanness but claims to free men from spiritual taint. Purification is sometimes merely a means of keeping evil at a distance. And a sacramental union with deity is itself no evidence of an advanced state of religious development. A sacrament may be, as this one is, full of the crudest magic, or it may be instinct with totemism, as Reuterskiöld has shown, in his article, *Die Entstehung des Speisesakramente*, published in *Religionswissenschaftliche Bibliothek* 4 (Heidelberg, 1912). I see no adequate evidence that the old rites of the Lupercalia were spiritualized. I see, rather, crude, magical rites unblushingly flourishing, even to the very end of paganism, when other ceremonies had taken on a higher and more spiritual meaning. If it is a primitive notion that wolves can be kept at a distance by magical rites, it is equally primitive to suppose that fertility can be induced by whipping the infertile person, and thus driving out of her the evil spirits that have caused her barrenness.

It may be, as Miss Franklin maintains, that the blood-ceremony was derived from the Orphics (87). Certain elements do seem to point in that direction. But we are not in a position to say that these elements contributed anything of spiritual content to that rite. It may equally well be that, adopted into an old, unspiritual, crudely magical ceremony, they played an unspiritual and crudely magical part. I find no evidence that the ancient significance of the Lupercalia was "reinterpreted" (97) by the new elements.

If it is questionable that, in this sense, at least, the development of the Lupercalia represents the spiritual development of the Roman people, the author abundantly justifies her other point, that the Lupercalia, as it is described in the literature, is not the product of any one period. If she errs here at all, it is in abbreviating too much the period of its development. The last addition she ascribes to the dark days of the Second Punic War, while Deubner, on page 507 of the paper referred to at the beginning of this review, maintains that the distinctively Greek elements in the rite were added as late as when Augustus reconstructed the festival.

I am not convinced that the race of the young men was a ritual flight, ending in a return and a sacramental eating of the flesh of the slain animal. Apparently it was not a flight, a stop, and a return, but an uninterrupted running around the hill until the starting-point was reached. I still incline to see in this race a magical circuit to keep harm, in the form of wolves, from the sheepfolds. Miss Franklin seems to think that the original course was not around the Palatine (41). True, no literary evidence exists that it was. But is not the evidence of the rite fairly conclusive? Under what influence could the place of the running undergo change? And if it was changed, why should it be transferred to a route whose only appropriateness, in the day of a big Rome, lay in the fact that it did represent the boundary of an early, and, to the masses, forgotten stage in the development of the town?

With the problem posed by the laughter of the young men from whose faces the blood had just been wiped by means of wool dipped in milk, many students of the rite have wrestled. Parallels are few. Cook (Zeus, 272) adduces two from Carthage and Sardinia, in both of which the laughter appears to denote a willingness to be sacrificed. Such an explanation for the Lupercalia Miss Franklin rejects, because she believes that a human being was not the original victim at this ceremony. If that is so, it seems to me an equally valid objection against the theory which she champions, namely, that the laughter was the expression of joy at being cleansed. If man be the only animal that laughs, no laughter could be an element in the rite until a human being became the victim.

No conceivable monograph on a subject so obscure and debatable could win the unqualified assent of any other scholar. Miss Franklin has done a good piece of work. Aside from her masterly first chapter, she has valuable digressions on the cult use of the wolf, the goat, the dog, wool, and milk. To the bibliography of Chapter IX she should have added J. Pley, *De Lanæ in Antiquorum Ritibus Usu* (Giessen, 1912), and K. Wyss, *Die Milch im Kultus der Griechen und Römer* (Giessen, 1915).

In spite of a tendency to build high on a slender foundation, especially in Chapter IX, Miss Franklin's monograph will be very useful. She arranges the evidence well, poses stimulating questions, and writes an easy, readable style.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

JOSEPH WILLIAM HEWITT



The *Sacra Idulia* in Ovid's *Fasti*: A Study of Ovid's Credibility in Regard to the Place and the Victim of this Sacrifice. By Horace Wetherill Wright. University of Pennsylvania Dissertation. Newark, New Jersey (1917). Pp. 54.

This dissertation deals with two points in Ovid's account of the sacrifice of a sheep to Jupiter on the Ides of each month.

The problem of the first chapter (9-31), which would seem to have been written when the author was a fellow of the American Academy at Rome, is briefly as follows. Ovid says (*Fasti* 1. 587) that the priest offered the entrails of a *semimas ovis* in the Temple of Jupiter. Was this sacrifice within the shrine (a most unusual place)? And what temple is meant? Was it the Capitoline Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus? This is very unlikely, because the flamen *Dialis* performed the sacrifice—this, by the way, is not certain—and he had nothing to do with the cult of this Etruscan importation. We must choose between the priest and the temple. Dr. Wright chooses the priest and rejects the temple on the Southern summit. *Festus* seems to place the rite on the Arx, or Northern summit. But we know of no temple of Jupiter there. Perhaps the slaying of the animal took place on the Arx, and the offering of the *exta* in the Regia, which the procession would pass in its progress along the Sacred Way.

Here begins one of those long discussions which rather distract attention from the author's thesis and look like padding for what would otherwise be a rather thin doctoral dissertation. Its ostensible intent is to prove that the Regia had nothing to do with the *Sacra Idulia*. No one has suggested that it had: the testimony of Varro is pretty definitely against it. The author himself admits that such a gratuitous supposition scarcely needs such elaborate disproof. It seems like a man of straw set up to be overwhelmed by a product of Dr. Wright's studies in the Roman Forum. Its net result is to prove that the *penetrale Numae* of *Fasti* 2.69 is the Regia, but it is not made clear in what way this demonstration advances the author's thesis. The net result of this whole digression (pages 19-28) is to show the futility of the suggestion made by the author on page 19.

The sacrifice, then, according to Ovid, took place in the Temple of Jupiter on the Arx. But there was no such temple there. Ovid never saw the rite—although it existed in his day—but got it out of a book. Being a poet and a story-teller, rather than a scholar, he misread his source, took the word *arx* in its general sense, and jumped to the conclusion that this hypaethral sacrifice was performed inside a temple, which would be the great edifice on the Southern summit of the Capitoline.

Now, as to the sex of the *ovis Idulis* (33-54), Ovid calls it *alba agna* in *Fasti* 1. 56, and *semimas ovis* in 1.588. How do these statements harmonize with each other and with the rule of Roman cult that male animals should be offered to male deities, female to female? Other apparent exceptions to the rule are a *capra* to *Vediovius* (in Gellius) and an *agna* to Jupiter (in Varro).

Dr. Wright sets out to prove the ritual rule correct by showing that the feminine gender is not significant. He gives a long discussion of epicene nouns as distinguished from nouns of common gender. In Varro *L. L.* 9. 55 ff., it is stated that the name of an animal may be epicene, though either masculine or feminine in grammatical form and gender, in cases where the sex is not emphasized in the writer's mind, because there is no difference in the way the two sexes of the animal in question are employed by man: *ideo equus dicitur et equa; in usu enim horum discrimina. . .* Surely to make his point, Dr. Wright should remodel his rendering of *horum*. He translates by "for there is a distinction in the way these two words are employed". But Varro meant not 'these two words' but 'these two animals'. It would seem, moreover, that on this principle the epicene use of names of animals would be found least of all in passages relating to ritual, where the matter of sex is important. Dr. Wright's discussion is not convincing; he raises too much on a slender foundation. In fact he seems to feel that to clinch his argument he must fall back on the ritual rule (pages 45, 52), and comes dangerously near assuming as correct the thing whose correctness he sets out to prove.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY JOSEPH WILLIAM HEWITT

#### AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT ATHENS

##### EXAMINATIONS FOR FELLOWSHIPS IN ARCHAEOLOGY MARCH 19, 20, 21, 1923

Two Fellowships in Archaeology, each of \$1,000, in the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, are at present offered to students who have had some archaeological training.

The object of the Fellowships is primarily to assist in the researches of the School and at the same time to provide well-trained Greek archaeologists for American Museums and institutions of higher learning. Hence in the selection of the Fellows attention is paid not only to evidence of some familiarity with the major subjects of Greek archaeology and the apparatus of the archaeologist, but also to indications of ability in independent investigation.

Candidates should therefore submit any papers which they have written, whether printed or not, soon after announcing their candidacy.

Competitive examinations are held at places convenient to the candidates, in March of each year. All candidates are examined in Modern Greek, and in the six archaeological subjects mentioned below. In one of the six subjects (to be selected by the candidate) the examination will be made more searching in order to test the candidate's preparation and his ability to begin at once the investigation of some problem. The six archaeological subjects, together with the books which satisfy the minimum requirements, are as follows: General Greek Archaeology, Greek Architecture, Greek Sculpture, Greek Vases (Fowler and Wheeler, *Greek Archaeology*); Topography and Monuments of Ancient Athens (Harrison and Verrall, *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*, or Weller, *Athens and its Monuments*, and the contents of Pausanias, Book 1); and Greek Epigraphy, with emphasis rather on Attic decrees than on the epichoric alphabets (Hicks and Hill, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, and the summary in Whibley, *Companion to Greek Studies*). Candidates are also expected to show some familiarity with the chief works of reference, with the archaeological

periodicals, and with some of the most recent archaeological discoveries and problems.

The secondary object of the Fellowships is to furnish assistance to the Faculty of the School in such ways as may be designated by the director, and especially to form a nucleus of students whose aim is to cultivate the spirit of archaeological study and research, and thus give esprit and solidarity to the whole attendance at the School. This object determines the general obligations of the Fellows. The specific requirements are as follows: to spend the full School year in Athens, unless excused by the Director for the better prosecution of investigation for part of the year elsewhere in Europe; to attend the lectures and take part in the trips of the School in accordance with the recommendation of the Director; to begin as soon as possible the investigation of some topic of research and to complete the paper by the end of the School year; and to report on January 1 and July 1 to the Chairman of the Committee on Fellowships with a written account of the work done as Fellow, especially in independent research. It is recommended that the special field of investigation, if not the topic itself, be selected soon after election as Fellow, by written conference with the Director or the Annual Professor, and that, whenever possible, the Fellows spend both the summer before and the summer after the School year in visiting the museums, libraries and Universities of Europe or in travel in Italy and Sicily, or in Greek lands. During the School year abundant opportunities of becoming familiar with the most important sites in Greece are offered to all the students and the Fellows should take advantage of these.

On the recommendation of the Director, a Fellow may be reelected for one year without reexamination.

Inquiries for further information should be addressed to the undersigned, Chairman of the Committee on Fellowships. Applications will be accepted up to February 25.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT,  
BURLINGTON, VERMONT

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

### A ROMAN DISCOVERY

Word has reached us here in Rome of accounts in the American papers purporting to describe the discovery, by a workman, near the Porta Maggiore, of a secret villa built by Taurus in order to take refuge from the vengeance of Nero's mother. It has been suggested that some more definite information from this side would be helpful.

I know the newspaper accounts only at second-hand, but it is clear that they have to do with a remarkable underground structure which was discovered in the spring of 1917, as the result of the settling of a railroad bed. Some of the Italian archaeologists endeavored to bring the mysterious edifice into connection with what Tacitus tells (Ann. 12. 59) of the *magicae superstitiones* of the consul of 44 A.D., T. Statilius Taurus, whose family is known to have possessed property in the vicinity; the hypothesis would appear to have lost nothing in the telling.

This underground building is constructed of good Roman concrete characteristic of the first century of our era. Its plan is that of a typical Christian basilica; three parallel barrel vaults, separated by piers, the central space being wider and loftier and having an apse, with half-dome, at the further end. An antechamber with painted walls reminds one of the *narthex* of early Churches. All the wall space, vaults, and piers of the main part of the building are decorated with exceptionally fine stucco reliefs, with ornamental borders, and especially with figures—Victories gracefully alighting, sacrificial or agonistic tables, Medusa heads, great vases flanked by animals, and in particular mythological subjects not all of which are easy to interpret. The artistic repertory is pure Greek, with

no suggestion of Oriental elements, and it is probable that we have to do with some Orphic or Neo-Platonic conventicle. Especially suggestive was the finding of the remains of a dog and a pig buried under the wall of the apse.

I published a brief account of the discovery, in *The Year's Work in Classical Studies for 1917*, pages 4-6, and my colleague Professor D. Densmore Curtis included the *basilica* in his illustrated article on recent discoveries, in *Art and Archaeology* 9 (1920), 271-276; he gave a further bibliography in connection with his discussion of the reliefs in the apse, in the *American Journal of Archaeology* 24 (1920), 146-150.

AMERICAN ACADEMY, ROME

A. W. VAN BUREN

### HERODOTUS AND THE ORIGIN OF LANGUAGE

In his article, *The Origin of Language*, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16.34-38, Dr. E. H. Sturtevant makes reference to the narrative in Herodotus (2.2) of the attempt of King Psammetichus to determine, experimentally, the original language of man. The character of the test has a modern flavor, and we ought, indeed, to hail Psammetichus as the father of experimental psychology!

It is interesting to note, however, that this episode is used—with all seriousness—by a recent writer on evolution, to support a certain doctrine. Dr. Albert Churchward, in his *Origin and Evolution of the Human Race* (London and New York, 1922), advances hypotheses regarding man's origin and distribution which differ *totò caelo* from those generally accepted by men of science. In particular, he postulates an African origin of the human race; man, he believes, developed from some ancestor common with that of the anthropoids, in the region of the equatorial lakes at the head of the Nile. In Dr. Churchward's view, our first parents were pigmies in form, the earliest example of whom is found in the Ape-man, whose skull-cap and thigh-bone were discovered some thirty years ago in the Island of Java.

In exploiting the story of Herodotus, Dr. Churchward draws attention (97, 98) to the curious fact that the modern African pigmy word for 'bread' is *Macchate* or *Bacchate* (*ch* is to be pronounced as *k*). This certainly recalls the word *bekos*, 'bread', which appears in Herodotus's story. Hence Dr. Churchward accepts, *mutatis mutandis*, the conclusion of Psammetichus—that the pigmy-jargon is the earliest tongue and the pigmies the earliest of the inhabitants of the earth. Of course the Egyptian monarch and the English savant have alike to assume that the Phrygian and the pigmy languages have not altered materially in some hundreds of thousands of years—which is, surely, an hard saying. Truly, the mental processes of the ancient and the modern investigator are often strangely similar.

JAMESTOWN COLLEGE,  
JAMESTOWN, N. D.

A. D. FRASER

### PEGASUS AS THE POET'S STEED

The fancy of Pegasus as 'the poet's steed' is sometimes called a quite modern one, and indeed it is not easy to cite any definite use of it earlier than the fifteenth century (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 14.200, 15.136). Perhaps it is implied on an ancient Roman sarcophagus (*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* 6.20, 152). This represents a man riding on a winged horse, with a female figure setting a crown upon his head. The epitaph is apparently that of a poet:

Ut te, Palladi, raptum flevire Camenae,  
fleverunt populi quos continet Ostia dia.  
Compare the famous epitaph of Naevius:  
Mortalis immortalis flere si foret fas,  
fleverent divae Camenae Naevium poetam.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

W. P. MUSTARD